



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

would be Liberals, three Conservatives and two Socialists, and the candidates of the respective parties receiving the highest vote would be elected. The process is simple and easily applied, and it works satisfactorily. Whether such a system would find favor in our country is doubtful, yet it is hard to foresee the results of any changes in popular institutions.

Professor Vincent's book gives a clear and instructive statement of the nature and operations of the Swiss government; it is full of interest for any student of politics.

JAMES BRECK PERKINS.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

The Origin of the Republican Form of Government in the United States of America. By OSCAR S. STRAUS. With an Introductory Essay by EMILE DE LAVELEYE. Second edition. New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1901.—xli, 151 pp.

In the sixteen years that have elapsed since Dr. Straus first published his little book, he has apparently found no reason to doubt the accuracy of its conclusions. Accordingly, a new edition now appears, slightly revised, and accompanied by an introductory essay in the familiar vein of the genial and prolific Professor de Laveleye, since deceased. The thesis of Dr. Straus is well known. It is that the adoption of a republican form of government by the people of the United States, after the separation from Great Britain, was largely influenced, if not absolutely determined, by the example of the Hebrew commonwealth, as described in the Old Testament. In support of the contention the author sets forth with some particularity, first, the pre-Revolutionary dread on the part of the Puritans lest an American episcopacy should be established by the British government and, second, the exploitation of Old Testament history and prophecy that constituted the staple of the discourses of the Puritan ministers who supported the cause of the patriots. The facts adduced are considered to prove that ecclesiastical influences were potent in bringing on the Revolution and that, when once independence had been resolved upon, the widespread conviction that God had directly sanctioned republican government for his chosen people, and had inspired the records of that people as a guide for all Christians, rendered monarchy and aristocracy impossible in the new organization that was set up.

The antipathy toward the Church of England in the strongly Puritan, and indeed in the other, colonies is a commonplace of history; and it cannot be doubted that this played some part in the

development of revolution. But that the example of the Israelites under the Judges effectively predisposed the Americans toward democracy or republicanism, is a proposition that demands for its demonstration a much more convincing array of evidence than Dr. Straus presents. His argument is bizarre from two points of view. In the first place, it is a staggering conception that

the children of Israel on the banks of the Jordan . . . not only recognized the guiding principles of civil and religious liberty, "that all men are created free and equal," that God and the law are the only kings, but also established a free commonwealth, a pure democratic republic under a written constitution, "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people." [Chap. VI, end.]

In a note the author, in this new edition, disclaims responsibility for the view of the Hebrew state laid down in the chapter which contains this passage, and declares that he is "chiefly guided" by the view held by the men of Revolutionary times; but the concluding phrases have an exceedingly modern sound, and are at least ill adapted to express the convictions of any one who lived before Abraham Lincoln.

In addition, however, to the remarkable idea that the Israelites stood for civil and religious liberty, the argument of Dr. Straus precisely inverts the relation of the Biblical doctrine to the Revolution and its consequences. It was not theories, but conditions, that made the revolution and the reorganization that followed. In defending and explaining the political development, the ministers resorted to the Scripture because it was their most familiar ground. They explained the situation in terms of the Old Testament history and prophecy, just as the lawyers explained it in terms of the English constitution, and as the historical students explained it in terms of Greek and Roman institutions. That Thomas Paine and Benjamin Franklin, whose acceptance of Christianity was so qualified, should have appealed to the Scriptures for support to the patriot cause, does, indeed, suggest that there were elements among the people to whom such an appeal would be attractive and convincing. But it does not prove that the revolution and reorganization happened only or chiefly because of the appeal.

By Dr. Straus's method of reasoning it could readily be proved that practically every extraordinary, or even ordinary, political or social phenomenon since the fourth century A.D. was chiefly inspired by the ancient Israelites. The Rev. Jonathan Mayhew

and the Rev. Samuel Langdon were not the first divines to discover that the policy they favored was foreshadowed by the Old Testament. The mediaeval literature of politics had consisted of little else than wearisome demonstrations that current problems had been solved centuries in advance in Mesopotamia, Egypt, Moab and Canaan. Moses, Joshua and Gideon had been mercilessly driven in order to fulfill the demands made upon them. Ehud and Judith had justified every assassin that raised his hand against an unpopular ruler. Saul and Samuel, David and Nathan, Ahijah and Jeroboam had done yeoman's service in determining the relation of secular to ecclesiastical authority. And Daniel and Ezekiel and Jeremiah had furnished the medieval fancy with material for endless exercise. In view of these facts, the various institutions of the middle ages, as well as the government of the United States, must be ascribed to Israelitish sources. It is proper to say, however, that no mediaeval writer, so far as the reviewer is aware, ever ascribed to the Hebrews the belief that all men are created equal, or an interest in civil and religious liberty. The fate of the Amalekites and the Canaanites in general, and of those who from time to time preferred Ashtaroth and Baal to Jehovah, seems to have made more impression on the mediaeval mind than on that of Dr. Straus.

WM. A. DUNNING.

The Law and Policy of Annexation—with Special Reference to the Philippines, together with Observations on the Status of Cuba.
By CARMAN F. RANDOLPH. New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1901.—xi, 226 pp.

One does not need to read many pages of this book to discover that its author, in spite of strong convictions on the questions both of law and of policy connected with the acquisition of the Philippines, has succeeded in preserving a moderation of tone that is often lacking in current discussions of these subjects. He has not been so successful, however, in preventing his feelings from influencing his judgment upon the matters of law involved, and as a result the book is so one-sided that many who are inclined to a view contrary to that taken by the author will perhaps lose sight of the ability with which the questions at issue are discussed.

The first two chapters deal with the acquisition of the Philippines by the United States and their general status in our governmental system after annexation. After showing that our title under international law is unimpeachable, Mr. Randolph argues that the islands